

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA


KAHEAL PARRISH,)	No. C 11-1438 LHK (PR)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER GRANTING MOTION
)	TO STAY DISCOVERY;
v.)	DENYING MOTIONS TO
)	COMPEL
A. SOLIS, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	(Docket Nos. 61, 68, 70)
)	

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging that prison officials violated his right to be free from excessive force. On December 5, 2011, Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment. On March 29, 2012, Defendants filed a motion to stay discovery pending the disposition of their argument that they are entitled to qualified immunity. On April 9, 2012, the Court denied Plaintiff's request to stay Defendants' motion for summary judgment so that he may have additional time to conduct discovery. On April 20, 2012, Plaintiff filed two motions to compel discovery.

As a general rule, a district court should stay discovery until the issue of qualified immunity is resolved. *See Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 598 (1998); *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*, 457 U.S. 800, 818 (1982). Accordingly, Defendants' motion to stay discovery until the Court has ruled on the issue of qualified immunity, as raised in Defendants' motion for summary judgment, is hereby GRANTED. (Docket No. 61.) In light of this ruling, Plaintiff's motions to compel are hereby DENIED. (Docket Nos. 68, 70.)

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 5/10/12


LUCY H. KOH
United States District Judge